1	has to read this thing.
2	MR. KELLER: You said wait until
3	November 4th. November 4th is when we are
4	providing these contracts and the ID of the
5	customers, but then you also said ten days
6	after the 21st.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's right.
8	MR. KELLER: Which was when the
9	contract I would hope that any requests for
.0	additional discovery could at least wait
.1	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's why they have
.2	to come to me.
.3	MR. KELLER: could at least wait
.4	until they see that thing we file on December
.5	the 1st.
.6	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's why they have
.7	to come to me.
.8	MR. KELLER: Okay.
.9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm not ruling
20	anything out, but believe me, nothing's going
21	to get by.
2	MR. KELLER: Okav.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Unless I say it's
2	okay, for the time being.
3	MR. KELLER: All right.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay? I'm trying to
5	do I'm trying to meet everybody's needs,
6	reasonable needs. That's a reasonable need.
7	MR. KELLER: I appreciate that.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Geno?
9	MR. GENO: And I'd like to suggest,
10	Your Honor, that there is a pretty good
11	possibility that some of the sale contracts are
12	not going to be heard until the 28th or the
13	29th of November. Could we make that report,
14	rather than ten days after the 21st, could we
15	make it seven days after the 29th?
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure.
17	MR. GENO: That would be much more
18	comprehensive, I think.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure.
20	MR. GENO: Thank you.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you have that?
22	MR. KELLER: Ten days, yes.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: January 29th, I'm
2	sorry, no. It's say that again.
3	MR. GENO: I said seven days after
4	the November 29th.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's what I thought.
6	November 29th plus seven. Okay. What else do
7	we have? Okay, well, let me back up a little
8	bit, then. Do I assume from all this that you
9	really don't need those valuations that I was
10	hammering on earlier?
11	MS. KANE: I think, Your Honor
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: The three
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: The three evaluations?
169000	
13	evaluations?
13 14	evaluations?  MS. KANE: it would be helpful to
13 14 15	evaluations?  MS. KANE: it would be helpful to have that.
13 14 15 16	evaluations?  MS. KANE: it would be helpful to have that.  JUDGE SIPPEL: For what?
13 14 15 16 17	evaluations?  MS. KANE: it would be helpful to have that.  JUDGE SIPPEL: For what?  MS. KANE: It's certainly a good
13 14 15 16 17	evaluations?  MS. KANE: it would be helpful to have that.  JUDGE SIPPEL: For what?  MS. KANE: It's certainly a good comparison of what the spectrum was worth then
13 14 15 16 17 18	evaluations?  MS. KANE: it would be helpful to have that.  JUDGE SIPPEL: For what?  MS. KANE: It's certainly a good comparison of what the spectrum was worth then compared to what it is now.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	worth or certainly somebody with some
2	qualifications made that determination. It
3	wasn't just pulled out of thin air. So in
4	terms of the analysis that was done to
5	determine what that value was, certainly would
6	be pertinent, but
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Banks don't really
8	have a very good track record for assessing.
9	(Laughter.)
LO	MS. KANE: I doubt it was the bank
L1	that did it, Your Honor. I'm sure they took
L2	some third party technical company that values
L3	
L4	MR. KELLER: Your Honor?
L5	MS. KANE: technology like this
L6	all the time, and, you know, it's those
L7	kinds of reports are used in litigation
L8	repeatedly. So I
L9	MS. GOING: The debtor has the
20	debtor has submitted that valuation in their
21	bankruptcy petition as well, so they have to
22	hold it to some standard. They must believe

it's true, because they provided that that was 1 2 the valuation of the spectrum in their bankruptcy petition. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, then --4 MR. KELLER: I'm going to come at 5 this again. Maybe I'm not making myself clear. 6 I quess my problem is not with providing the 7 valuations, to the extent that we have it. 8 9 My problem is that the continual assertion that the valuation is somehow 10 relevant, that what people may think or assess 11 12 some kind of value of these licenses are in any way relevant. What is going to be relevant is 13 what the actual sales contracts that come in 14 for the licenses are. 15 When sales contracts come in for the 16 licenses, to sell the licenses for X amount of 17 dollars, it doesn't matter what some valuation 18 19 three years ago said it was, or what some extrapolation of the lease today says it is. 20 For Second Thursday purposes, it 21 just matters what that dollar amount is that

the actual contract is going to bring into the 1 bankruptcy court, and how that money's going to 2 be distributed. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well --4 MR. KELLER: So, I mean, all this 5 6 talk about the value -- I don't agree that the 7 valuations are relevant to the Second Thursday analysis. 8 9 MS. KANE: Your Honor, I would disagree with that on the basis that this 10 valuation is an overall valuation of the entire 11 12 spectrum. And what we've heard today is that 13 these contracts are piecemeal contracts for 14 15 only portions of the spectrum, so, again, going back to what the Enforcement Bureau was talking 16 about, in terms of the Second Thursday 17 analysis, we're going to have to see how much 18 19 of the spectrum is actually being sold. this is a valuation of the entire spectrum. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: 21 Well, as long as -thank you. That's true. But the nature of --22

you're in litigation now, you're not in some 1 2 other forum, and information which is relevant is a very broad definition of relevance, under 3 our discovery rules, brings those evaluations 4 into play, for whatever purpose. 5 They may not be admissible as 6 evidence, when it comes down to that, but that 7 doesn't make any -- that's not a standard. 8 9 Particularly if it's available. They're not creating an evaluation for the purposes of this 10 They've asked -- whatever is there the 11 12 Bureau is asking for, Mr. McFadden and his counsel are looking for. That's all, and I 13 don't know what the hesitation is to give it to 14 15 them. I told you, my problem 16 MR. KELLER: 17 is not with whatever valuation we have. problem is with the continual reliance on, that 18 somehow that forms the Second Thursday 19 I don't think that --20 analysis. JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you think that the 21

-- what, do you think that they somehow are

1	going to be misused or used for an
2	MR. KELLER: I think more arguments
3	are going to be made, that we're going to have
4	to spend time and legal expenses responding to
5	that are irrelevant.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: I can't protect you
7	from arguments. With anything else in life,
8	but not that. It's there. So okay, you're
9	going get everything that they have on
10	evaluation, correct?
11	MS. KANE: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's going to
13	be it. That'll be in my order. Now, I'm
14	relying on you all to work out the details.
15	And that will be, you know so your specific
16	pleading on this will be ample for, I'm sure,
17	everybody. And you get that to them in a day
18	or so, right?
19	MS. KANE: Absolutely, Your Honor.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Now, what else
21	is left? What else is left? The bank. You
22	really want that, you want to subpoena the

1	bank?
2	MS. KANE: Yes, if that's the only
3	way that we can get the 2008 valuation of the
4	spectrum.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that true, Mr.
6	Seno, or Mr. Geno, I'm sorry.
7	MR. GENO: We do not have it yet,
8	Your Honor. We've asked for it, so I certainly
9	have no objection to a subpoena.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, sometimes a
11	subpoena becomes almost like a friendly
12	subpoena. I mean, as long as the bank has the
13	they live in this world that they think they
14	have to have a subpoena for everything they
15	give out, whether or not they need it or not.
16	Kind of like telephone records.
17	MS. KANE: Well, if Mr. Geno would
18	give us a contact, we'd be happy to contact the
19	bank.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's try it first
21	that way. Tell them the Judge is prepared to
22	give me subpoena, but would you do it without

1	one, or do you need one? I rather tell them,
2	do you need a subpoena?
3	MS. KANE: Let's go with that.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And you'll come to me
5	with an application, and you'll have it the
6	same day.
7	MS. KANE: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, is there
9	anything else?
10	MR. MCFADDEN: Your Honor, if I may,
11	we spent quite a bit of time on the issue of
12	the spectrum valuation and the goal of that is
13	to determine whether the value of the assets
14	exceeds the value of debt owed to innocent
15	creditors, such that the hearing would have to
16	go forward in any event.
17	If I may, there is another issue
18	designated for hearing that is not affected by
19	the Second Thursday analysis.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's true.
21	MR. MCFADDEN: And that's the
22	question of whether certain of Maritime's site-

	based licenses terminated automatically for
2	failure to construct.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I'm sorry. I
4	wasn't thinking of that, but, yes, okay. Do
5	you follow that, Ms. Kane?
6	MS. KANE: Absolutely, Your Honor.
7	MR. MCFADDEN: And so, Your Honor,
8	we would suggest that, because that's not
9	impacted by a Second Thursday analysis, the
10	hearing should proceed, at a minimum with
11	respect to that issue.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: How does that strike
13	you, Mr. Keller?
14	MR. KELLER: Well, Your Honor, I
15	think, again, it is our hope and desire to
16	resolve that issue outside the context of
17	hearing, if possible, after these other Second
18	Thursday issues are dealt with. In other
19	words, if first of all, we don't anticipate
20	coming back for a hearing on that at all. I
21	mean
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why?

MR. KELLER: We're going to find 1 2 some way to resolve it through a combination of a summary decision or some sort of -- like, 3 when I say a hearing, actually the litigating. 4 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. 5 MR. KELLER: I think we're going to 6 be able to present facts sufficient for a 7 summary decision. Now, granted, there may be 8 arguments about that, on the question of 9 construction. On the question of permanent 10 discontinuance there is not going to be a 11 12 factual dispute. In other words, there is not going 13 to be a factual dispute about whether a station 14 is or is not off the air. The issue is going 15 to be strictly a legal argument about whether 16 or not the discontinuance of that station 17 constitutes a permanent discontinuance, and 18 that's going to be a legal analysis. 19 MR. MCFADDEN: That, Your Honor --20 21 I'm sorry.

MR. KELLER: So that's, basically,

1	it. But, all I would say is I would also
2	address this in the comprehensive filing about
3	what our proposal is for dealing with this, and
4	whether it would require any further hearing or
5	not. But we're going to do our very best to
6	make sure that there is no need for further
7	full-blown hearing issues on that question.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand
9	MR. KELLER: Your Honor
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me hear
11	from Mr. McFadden.
12	MR. MCFADDEN: Your Honor, if I may,
13	what Mr. Keller has just said suggests that the
14	hearing on the question of the site-based
15	licenses could be very expeditious. You know,
16	I don't think there's any reason to delay it.
17	Just, to take a step back, where we
18	are in this proceeding is that the Commission
19	designated for hearing, among other issues, the
20	question of whether Maritime's licenses
21	terminated automatically, and thus, no longer
22	exist.

1	The Commission designated that as an
2	issue for hearing before Your Honor. Maritime
3	has moved, essentially, to stay the hearing
4	based on the application of the Second Thursday
5	doctrine. That application has nothing to do
6	with the issue of the site-based licenses, and
7	there's no reason to stay the hearing with
8	respect to that issue, Your Honor.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I mean, you
10	said you're going to proceed you're thinking
11	of a summary decision.
12	MR. KELLER: Well, that's one
13	possible resolution. See, the other
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it's got to be
15	resolved some way.
16	MR. KELLER: It's got to be
17	resolved.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's got to be
19	resolved in this forum.
20	MR. KELLER: It's got to be resolved
21	some way in this forum, but also what will
22	happen under Second Thursday is, if the other

licenses are resolved under Second Thursday, 1 these particular licenses -- that particular 2 3 issue, excuse me, is not a basic qualifying issue, and so there is, then, the possibility 4 of resolving this during negotiating 5 settlement, as well. It wouldn't exist for a 6 basic qualifying issue. 7 JUDGE SIPPEL: It wouldn't exist for 8 a basic qualifying issue. 9 MR. KELLER: What I'm saying is, 10 we're working hard to come up with a way of 11 resolving these in either some sort of an 12 expedited hearing or a non-hearing process, 13 which, obviously, will have to be agreed to or 14 cooperated with by the other parties, and I 15 will include that in the comprehensive filing 16 17 that we make. Part of the reason of not going 18 forward right now is, I mean, quite frankly, we 19 don't have -- we're not able to finance the 20 litigation of that issue at the moment. 21

MS. KANE: Well, Your Honor, that

1	shouldn't be an excuse for not
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: I never
3	MS. KANE: going forward with
4	litigation.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: heard of that
6	basis of defense.
7	MR. KELLER: That's the nature of
8	bankruptcy.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I know, but
10	it's the nature of enforcement that I just
11	can't, I can't buy that.
12	And, I mean, and also, I mean, the
13	way you described to me what that construction
14	issue is about, and the intent to permanently
15	discontinue as opposed to not permanently
16	discontinue, that leaves a question of fact
17	open right there.
18	MS. KANE: Well, Your Honor, we've
19	served discovery, as has Mr. Havens, directed
20	to these very issues, and none of that
21	discovery has been responded to.
22	So should Your Honor agree that this

hearing should proceed with regard to those 1 issues, certainly, both the Bureau and Mr. 2 Havens would be entitled to responses to the 3 discovery that's directed to that issue. 4 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'll tell you 5 6 what to do. Send me up -- that is, get to me, again, request relief to pursue discovery on 7 that issue and outline what the scope of that 8 9 discovery would be. MS. KANE: We can do that, Your 10 Honor. 11 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: That's all. It doesn't have to be a -- I mean, it's up to me. 13 I will make it, it's up to me to decide whether 14 I want to get further pleas, and I might do it 15 right on that or -- in other words, I'm not 16 expecting that it's going to be successfully 17 objective, let me say that, without predicting 18 what the outcome is going to be. I'll figure 19 that one out. That's my problem. Your problem 20 is just getting it in. 21

MS. KANE: We can do that, Your

1	Honor.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: And my intention on
3	that would be to have a minimum of discovery
4	and get that issue right on the table, while
5	all this other stuff is floating around. I'm
6	not going to hold an issue up until after
7	everything else is done.
8	I mean, how are you going to be any
9	richer after you go through bankruptcy than you
10	are now?
11	MR. KELLER: Understood.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Or maybe you can get
13	a local public defender or something, I don't
14	know. For that issue.
15	MR. KELLER: We have those here?
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: For that issue.
17	Well, that'll take care well never mind. I
18	know you're not going to go down that road.
19	I'm certainly saying is that that issue has to
20	be litigated, and there's no reason to hold it
21	up.

Okay, and also we've got the

1	forfeiture question. I do not know what it is,
2	but you said that you think you're going to
3	take care of forfeiture, like it's not a
4	problem. How you going to do that without any
5	money?
6	MR. KELLER: We were going to agree
7	we're going to allocate a portion of the
8	proceeds to voluntary contribution in lieu of
9	the forfeiture, and also, if the company ends
10	up with no money, they have no money to pay a
11	forfeiture with, too. That's another point.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, get the
13	promissory note and
14	MR. KELLER: Yes.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if I have to
16	I don't think there's ever I mean, there's
17	no final answer to any of those things
18	MR. KELLER: True.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: right here today.
20	I'm really sorry, because I know that I'm
21	running the tab up on this case.
22	MR. KELLER: It's all right.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: I think we're all set
2	for everything we're going to yes, sir.
3	MR. RICHARDS: Jack Richards, Your
4	Honor. As I mentioned at the beginning of the
5	hearing, we represent four oil and gas
6	companies, one of which, at this point, despite
7	as much fun as it is to participate in this
8	hearing, has had enough, and has filed a motion
9	to withdraw its notice of appearance. May we
10	have a ruling
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I'm sorry.
12	MR. RICHARDS: on that?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. I have it here,
14	I wrote it down, in fact, to quickly address
15	that and then get an original order out on it.
16	MR. RICHARDS: It was unopposed.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, it was. And
18	it's been a while. Motion to withdraw and
19	orders of appearance.
20	MR. RICHARDS: Okay.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: And as applied by Mr.
22	Jack Richards. Yes, sir. I apologize.

1	MR. RICHARDS: Thank you, Your
2	Honor.
3	(Simultaneous speaking.)
4	MR. RICHARDS: I would also like to
5	take a minute
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're right.
7	MR. RICHARDS: to follow up on
8	Mr. Zdebski's comments and Mr. Plache's
9	comments about the nature of the applicants in
10	this proceeding, because I'm concerned
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are you back on the
12	case again? I thought you just withdrew.
13	MR. RICHARDS: We still have four
14	other clients in this hearing.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, okay. I see.
16	Right.
17	MR. RICHARDS: And that includes
18	three oil and gas companies, and one electric
19	utility.
20	The oil and gas companies need the frequencies
21	to control pipelines. The electric utility
22	needs the frequencies to control its electric

distribution system.

These are critical infrastructure companies, as are the other applicants in this proceeding. All totaled, the original 12 assignment applications involved four oil and gas companies, seven electric utilities, and one railroad.

The Commission, in the hearing designation order, allowed the railroad to show why its application should be removed from the hearing. The railroad showed that, and the Commission hasn't ruled on it yet.

Our clients, and a group of others, filed a petition for reconsideration before the Commission, supporting the railroad, and requesting that because these are also critical infrastructure companies, their applications also be removed from the hearing process. The Commission didn't act on it. We filed a request for expedited action because these companies need these frequencies. The Commission still hasn't ruled on our request.

The Bureau takes the position that

Jefferson Radio prohibits a grant of these

applications. Jefferson Radio was a broadcast

case. We briefed that issue in our petition

for reconsideration. We don't agree with that.

We cited cases in here holding that

the deferral of all action on all of the

the deferral of all action on all of the licenses held by a multiple licensee, like this one, pending a final resolution of character issues raised by alleged misconduct, may operate to the detriment of the public interest.

We cited cases the decision of
whether to approve a license transfer "turns
upon a balancing of the public interest
considerations favoring the free
transferability of the licensee's interests
against the Commission's long-term interest in
deterrence to determine whether, on the whole,
the public interest weighs in favor of free
transferability."

The Commission has found that the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

weight for allowing free transferability of licenses is greater in the non-broadcast context, such as here, than in the broadcast context.

We concluded at a citation with this quotation. "In view of these significant differences between broadcast and non-broadcast services, we believe that no valid purpose would be served here by applying our broadcast policy of prohibiting transfers when there are outstanding character issues to be resolved against the transferor.

The facts in this case reveal clearly that no harm to the public will occur by accepting these applications from our normal policy and that, to the contrary, the public interest will be served by a transfer of these facilities to a qualified applicant. Thus we'll allow the transfer."

There's no question that has been raised about the qualifications of these applicants to receive these licenses.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: I
2	MR. RICHARDS: They need the
3	frequencies, and they have been held up now for
4	up to two years in trying to get them, to the
5	point where one of them, an oil and gas company
6	that needs the frequencies, has thrown in the
7	towel.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well I'm very
9	sympathetic to that, but I can't do anything
10	about it.
11	MR. MCFADDEN: Your Honor, just
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
13	MR. MCFADDEN: a few quick points
14	on that. First, those applications are all
15	subject to pending petitions to deny, which is
16	what we're doing in this proceeding.
17	Second, with all due respect to Mr.
18	Richards, I don't believe you have any
19	authority to act for the Commission with
20	respect to that pending petition for
21	reconsideration
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's just